



**You have downloaded a document from
RE-BUS
repository of the University of Silesia in Katowice**

Title: Teaching Lucian in Middle Byzantium

Author: Przemysław Marciniak

Citation style: Marciniak Przemysław. (2019). Teaching Lucian in Middle Byzantium. „Philologia Classica” (Vol. 14, fasc. 2, 2019, s. 267-279), DOI: 10.21638/11701/spbu20.2019.207



Uznanie autorstwa - Licencja ta pozwala na kopiowanie, zmienianie, rozprowadzanie, przedstawianie i wykonywanie utworu jedynie pod warunkiem oznaczenia autorstwa.



UNIWERSYTET ŚLĄSKI
W KATOWICACH



Biblioteka
Uniwersytetu Śląskiego



Ministerstwo Nauki
i Szkolnictwa Wyższego



UDC 821.14

Teaching Lucian in Middle Byzantium*

Przemysław Marciniak

University of Silesia in Katowice,

pl. Sejmu Śląskiego 1, 40-032, Katowice, Poland; przemyslaw.marciniak@us.edu.pl

For citation: Przemysław Marciniak. Teaching Lucian in Middle Byzantium. *Philologia Classica* 2019, 14 (2), 267–279. <https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu20.2019.207>

The following paper explores Lucian and his writings through the lens of Byzantine education and investigates how his works could have been used in teaching the Greek language and literature in the Middle Byzantine period. It analyses a number of (didactic) texts which either refer to or are based on Lucianic writings, focusing primarily on two periods — ninth/tenth and twelfth centuries when Lucian-related activities (i.e. mostly writing texts, which were inspired by his works) seem to be especially widespread. Interestingly enough, there was never much interest in Lucian's biography and the more prevalent view was to cast Lucian as an Attic writer, whose texts were sources of correct grammar, vocabulary and phrases. This paper also offers a preliminary analysis of the four extant *schede*, that is school exercises, based on the writings of Lucian, which are transmitted in two manuscripts (Pal. gr. 92 and Paris gr. 2556). These *schede* allow a brief glimpse into the way of using Lucian's writing in the twelfth-century educational practices. Finally, this contribution brings the diplomatic transcription (which includes also interlinear notes) of the hitherto unedited three *schede* from Pal. gr. 92. Two of these *schede* are anonymous while the third one was penned by Michael Attikos, a person possibly mentioned by Anna Komnene in the *Alexiad*.

Keywords: Lucian, Byzantine education, *schede*, Michael Attikos.

To paraphrase Nigel Wilson, the response of the Byzantines to Lucian's writings is rather hard to gauge.¹ It is even harder to determine reliably how educators used his writings in Byzantium.² In an unpublished paper, Charis Messis claims that “each phase of

* This paper was written as part of research funded by the National Center for Science (NCN). UMO2013/10/E/HS2/00170. If not stated otherwise, all translations are my own. I am indebted to the anonymous readers for the *Philologia Classica* for their remarks and to Professor Elena Zheltova for her kindness and efficacy in handling the submission.

¹ Wilson 1996, 177.

² On the so-called “secondary education in Byzantium” see Efthymiadis 2005.

© St. Petersburg State University, 2019

Byzantine history — with turning points at the ninth to tenth, the eleventh to twelfth and, finally, the fourteenth centuries — rediscovered Lucian in its own ways and according to its own cultural, literary, and **educational** needs”.³ Messis is undoubtedly correct and students of the Byzantine educational system have already remarked that Lucian’s writings served as a didactic tool throughout the history of the Empire.⁴ Yet the evidence is fragmented and scattered chronologically; most of it is indirect.

Perhaps the best example is the correspondence between Theodore Phialites and Michael Gabras in the fourteenth century. This is, in fact, doubly indirect testimony because Phialites’ letters are lost, therefore the discussion is reconstructed on the basis of Gabras’ arguments.⁵ Little is known about Phialites⁶ but Gabras is known to have taught in Constantinople.⁷ While Gabras expressed a clearly anti-Lucianic attitude due to Lucian’s religious (dis)beliefs,⁸ Phialites’ seems to have been more forgiving and, above all, more pragmatic. Phialites apparently claimed that Lucian is worth saving because he provides a proper linguistic model “for speaking” (163.25–27 ed. Dyck: εἰ δ’ ὅτι ῥήτωρ τις αὐτὸς καὶ τοῖς χρωμένοις οἷός τέ ἐστι τὴν γλῶτταν ἱκανὴν παρασκευάζειν εἰς τὸ λέγειν, διὰ τοῦτο ἀξιοῖς αὐτὸν τε σῶζεσθαι). His statement echoes an earlier attitude towards Lucian, that the usefulness of his works outweighed the potential religious and moral risks they could present. Nevertheless, Phialites’ claim is of a general nature, it does not inform us *how* and *for what purposes exactly* teachers employed Lucianic writings. The principal types of testimony that relate to Lucian’s role in the Byzantine classroom are dictionaries and mentions in grammatical and rhetorical treatises, both of which confirm that Lucianic writings were used for educational purposes. A further, much rarer, type consists of several Lucianic *schede* dating to the twelfth century, which provide evidence of how his texts were used. This paper explores Lucian and his writings through the lens of Byzantine education and investigates how his works could have been used in teaching the Greek language and literature in the Middle Byzantine period.

The earliest extant manuscripts containing Lucian’s words seem to suggest that his writings became part of the *curriculum studiorum* between the ninth and the tenth centuries.⁹ Moreover, the ninth-century work of a didactic character ascribed to George Choiroboskos, *Epimerisms on Homer*, contains a reference to Lucian.¹⁰

³ Messis (forthcoming).

⁴ See Markopoulos 2006: 88 (where he lists the dialogues of Lucian among the school texts).

⁵ For an in-depth discussion of these letters see Christidis 2015.

⁶ See Trapp (et al.) 2001, entry 29718.

⁷ Constantinides 1982, 95.

⁸ Gabras is not the only teacher of this period who rekindles old prejudices towards Lucian. The same sentiments can be detected in the writings of Manuel Philes and Alexios Makrembolites. It is not entirely clear what triggered these negative responses, especially in a period when clinging to the Greek past seemed to be one of the defining elements of Byzantine intellectual identity. However, some intellectuals may have felt uncomfortable with Lucian’s anti-Christian ideas.

⁹ When it comes to the manuscript evidence, apart from the famous Harley 5694 (dated to ca. 912–914), which according to some scholars may have contained all of Lucian’s works, there is also Vat. gr. 90 (tenth century), which transmits seventy-five of them; Conv. Soppr. 77 (also tenth century) contains fifty-four of the satirist’s texts. See Marciniak 2016, 5. Perhaps further proof of Lucian’s popularity in the tenth century is the testimony of Liutprand; see Newlin 1927. For possible Lucianic echoes in tenth century hagiography see Angelidi 2015, 33–34.

¹⁰ E 71, ed. Dyck: ἀπριάτην ἀνάποινον, ἀγειν θ’ ἱερὴν ἐκατόμβην (A 99) [...] ἢ ἀπὸ κλητικῆς, ὡς τὸ Ἡρακλῆς „Ἡράκλεις, ὦ Ἡράκλεις“ (Luc. Iupp. trag. 32), ἐπίρρημα θαυμαστικὸν ἀντὶ τοῦ ὦ τοῦ θαύματος.

Wilson has argued that extensive Lucianic scholia (especially scholia composed and gathered in the ninth century) suggest that his writings were used as a didactic tool.¹¹ Modern scholars frequently employ scholia in discussions of how the scholiasts, most notably Arethas, conceptualized Lucian the writer.¹² Yet scholia were originally used as tools to explain ancient texts. Some elucidate historical, mythological¹³ and social contexts¹⁴, while others contain notes designed to help readers understand the grammar and vocabulary of a text.¹⁵ Therefore, regardless of the date of composition,¹⁶ scholia could perform their didactic function in subsequent periods. Closely connected to Lucianic scholia is a lexicon, preserved in Coisl. 345 (10th century),¹⁷ originally intended to provide explanations for the texts of Lucian entitled *Συναγωγή λέξεων χρησίων ἐκ τῶν τοῦ Λουκιανοῦ*.¹⁸ The dictionary is heavily dependent on the scholia,¹⁹ although the content was adapted so that it could be used without the presence of Lucian's works. For example, the *scholion* on *Kynaigeiros* (*Demonax*) reads as follows:

Κυ να ί γ ε ι ρ ο ν *] τοῦτο γὰρ Κυναίγειρος πέπονθεν Ἀθηναῖος ἐν τῇ πρὸς Πέρσας ναυμαχίᾳ πελέκει πρὸς Πέρσου τὴν χεῖρα ἀποκοπεῖς

“This suffered Kynaigeiros, who in the naval battle against the Persians, lost his hand because of the Persian axe.”

The compiler of the lexicon changes the text slightly so it could function on its own: ὅτι Κυναίγειρος Ἀθηναῖος ὢν ἐν τῇ πρὸς Πέρσας ναυμαχίᾳ πελέκει πρὸς Πέρσου τὴν χεῖρα ἀποκοπεῖς (p. 321).

Entries within the lexicon are grouped according to the order of Lucian's writings, so the first cluster concerns the *Dialogue of the Courtesans*, the second the *Phalaris*, then the *Demonax* etc. (this division is not, however, marked in the manuscript). It is tempting to posit that this organization reflects the content of a lost manuscript, although this remains conjecture.

A crucial difference between the scholia (and especially the scholia of Arethas) and the lexicon is that the latter limits itself to explanations, without a trace of Arethas' harsh

τοῦτο λέγει Λουκιανὸς (l.l.) ἀντὶ θαυμαστικοῦ ἐπιρρήματος παραλαμβάνων. On the text see Dickey 2007, 27–28 On Choiboskos see Kaster 1988, 394–396.

¹¹ Wilson 2007, 57. Edition in Rabe 1902.

¹² See a recent discussion by Russo 2011.

¹³ For instance a scholion on the phrase πρὸς τῆς Στυγὸς in DDeor 4: τὸ τῆς Στυγὸς ὕδωρ ὄρκον φασι θεῶν καὶ κυρίως ἐν Ἄιδου εἶναι τοῦτο. διὸ καὶ νῦν τοῦτο αὐτὸν τὸν Κέρβερον ὥρκωσεν (they say that the waters of Styx are the oath of gods and that this is lawfully in Hades. On this account nowadays they make oaths on the very Cerberus).

¹⁴ Some of scholia seem to betray a rather surprising lack of a scholiast's confidence in readers'/ students' sense of humour and intelligence. A scholion on DDeor. 6 defines the phrase ἅπαντες φαλακροί (all *are* bald) in such a way ὅτι γὰρ νεκροὶ τὰς τρίχας οὐκ ἔχουσιν (because the dead don't have hair).

¹⁵ A scholion on DDeor 4 explains the relatively rare verb διαμέλλοντα with a much more frequent βραδύνοντα. This *scholion* is transmitted by Vat. gr. 90, which contains class I of the scholia.

¹⁶ The edited scholia are dated to between the fifth and tenth centuries. There remain unedited scholia in Vindobonensis phil. gr. 123 dating from the twelfth to the fourteenth century.

¹⁷ This is a very important manuscript which transmits many lexicographical works, some of them as a *codex unicus*, see Leeuw 2000. I have consulted the digital version of the manuscript.

¹⁸ First edition Bachmann 1828, 319–348; minor corrections proposed by Boudreaux 1906, 51–53.

¹⁹ On the possible relationship of the manuscript to Arethas see Lemerle 1971, 228. Some of the scholia edited by Rabe are taken from the lexicon, see Rabe 1902, IV.

criticism of Lucian. Among thirty-seven works that Coisl. 345 transmits, there are works both of general character (e. g. *Antiatticista*, *Περὶ συντάξεως*) and lexica pertaining to individual authors (e. g. Homer, Plato). Moreover, on fol. 214–223 there is also a Biblical dictionary entitled *Λέξεις τῆς Ὀκτατατεύχου*. This evidence suggests that Lucianic material must have been regarded as important (at least linguistically), otherwise it is unlikely that such a lexicon would have been included in the collection.²⁰

Furthermore, Lucian is among the authors discussed by ninth-century author Photios in his *Bibliotheca*, though this is not necessarily proof that his writings were a core part of *curriculum studiorum* at that time. Photios mentions that he read texts such as the *Phalaris*, the *Dialogues of the Dead*, and the *Dialogues of the Courtesans*, and it is difficult to imagine that he discussed commonly read and widely known works.²¹

Yet perhaps there is nothing contradictory in the testimonies discussed so far. What is observable in the ninth and the tenth centuries is a slow process of re-discovering Lucianic texts and integrating them into Byzantine educational practices. This could explain the compiling of material related to Lucian (scholia, lexica) in this period. These activities allowed to use Lucian more actively in the subsequent periods. In the eleventh century, Michael Psellos included Lucian in the short treatise *On the Different Styles of Certain Writings*. He describes Lucian's style as playful and categorizes it with romances and the writings of Philostratos of Lemnos.²² Stratis Papaioannou has remarked that although such playful writing is important for "the creation of one's own style", an aspiring rhetor has first to indulge the "Muses" (serious writing), rather than the "Graces" (entertaining discourse).²³ Psellos' treatise may be more than just his idiosyncratic preference, especially when it comes to the "Graces", it may also reflect the educational practices of his times. Be that as it may, Lucian's texts are not discussed in any pre-Pselian rhetorical treatises (there exist, usually short, mentions of Lucian's works in other texts, e. g. in Eunapios' *Lives of the Sophists*), nor are they thoroughly discussed by other Byzantine writers. This semi-invisibility of the Syrian rhetor in theoretical discussions is an almost constant feature (with some exceptions) throughout the history of the Byzantine Empire.²⁴ However, in discussing the importance of Lucian, and the usefulness of his style, two concepts seem to be conflated in scholarly literature: his importance as a powerful rhetor and a master of style²⁵ and his usefulness for studying Attic Greek. Both Photios and Psellos emphasize the rhetorical skill in his writings: their playfulness,

²⁰ The same manuscript preserves also the *Συναγωγή λέξεων χρησίων* (the so-called *Lexicum Bachmannianum* or *Lexicum Bekkeri* VI, eighth/ninth century), which also refers to the writings of Lucian.

²¹ Warren Treadgold argued that Photios included only texts that were not part of the standard *curriculum studiorum*, see Treadgold 1980, 6.

²² Psellos, *On the Different Styles of Certain Writings*, 48: "Those who read the book of Leukippe and that of Charikleia, and any other book of delight and charming graces such as the writings of Philostratos of Lemnos and whatever Lucian produced in a spirit of indolent playfulness" (transl. in Barber — Papaioannou 2017, 104).

²³ Barber-Papaioannou 2017: 102.

²⁴ Psellos' treatise was reused in the rhetorical manual from the late twelfth or thirteenth century entitled *On the Four Parts of the Perfect Speech*, see Hörandner 2012. According to the author: "ὁ τρίτος παντοδαπὸν ἔχει τὸ καλόν" ("the third one (Lucian) has all sorts of good things"). In the early fourteenth century, Theodore Metochites compared Lucian and Libanios. His text, however, is once again focused more on the use of the Attic dialect than on the rhetorical subtleties, text edited in Hult 2002, 162–163.

²⁵ See for instance an anonymous commentary on Aristotle's *Rhetoric* 1358bd, dated to the 12th century, which most likely refers to Lucian as one of the "δεινοὶ ῥήτορες" ("powerful rhetors" ed. 10, 25–27 Rabe)

comic effects, lightness and lucidity.²⁶ In other words, they treat Lucian's works as rhetorical models for entertaining discourse. Yet, it could be argued that the more prevalent view was to cast Lucian as an Attic writer, whose texts were sources of correct grammar, vocabulary and phrases.

The Komnenian period brings more substantial evidence that teachers used and students read Lucian's texts. Unlike earlier writers, twelfth-century literati and teachers, such as Theodore Prodromos, Eustathios of Thessalonike, John Tzetzes, and Nikephoros Basilakes, demonstrate direct knowledge of the Lucianic corpus. Basilakes does this in his enkomion of the dog by referring to the passage from the *Gods in Council*.²⁷ Tzetzes mentions *Praise of the Fly* while discussing the paradoxical enkomion (*Chil.* 11. 385)²⁸ and treats Lucianic writings as a source of encyclopaedic information.²⁹ Gregory of Pardos, in his *Commentary on Pseudo-Hermogenes' On the Method of Skilfulness* (7.2, p. 1138 ed. Waltz), refers to the satirist while discussing the use of the diminutives (the only passage in which the satirist makes an appearance) and remarks that "Lucian has many of this kind" (καὶ ὁ Λουκιανὸς τοιαῦτα πολλὰ ἔχει).³⁰ This passage emphasizes the grammatical value of Lucian's writings and suggests how teachers could have used them. Yet, as in previous periods, there is virtually no theoretical discussion of Lucian's writings and little apparent interest in his biography.³¹ Eustathios characterizes him as a "later Atticist" (καὶ νῦν τὸ «ἥδη» μέλλοντι ἀνακολουθῶς τῇ χρήσει τῶν ὕστερον Ἀττικιστῶν, ὧν ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ Λουκιανός, *Comm. ad Il.* 3.880.16), while Tzetzes writes that Lucian's parents moved from Syria to Patras (thus arguing that Lucian and Lukios of Patras are the same author).³² But such information is rare; it is as if Lucian's *vita* was of no interest (there was no, however, any ancient *vita Luciani*, which could have been re-used in the later period).

Similarly, Lucian is absent from most discussions concerned with subtler matters than pure grammar. The few exceptions include the aforementioned Basilakes, who characterized Lucian as "ὁ γελοιαστῆς, ὁ φιλοπαίγμων ὁ κωμικός" (*De cane* 1). Such descriptors mark the Syrian's role as a provider of entertaining discourse, as discussed by Psellos. The most avid imitator of Lucian, Prodromos, never commented on his style or rhetorical prowess, apart from calling him "a sweet Syrian" (ὁ γλυκὺς Σύρος, *Against the Man with a Long Beard*, 25). Only once in the entire Prodromic corpus does there appear a remark that could pass for a theoretical comment. In *On Those Who Blaspheme Against Providence on Account of Poverty*, Prodromos refers to Lucian by saying "ἀλλὰ τούτων ὑμῖν αἰτία ἢ ἄγνοια" and comments that only this passage, taken from the *Slander*, was not

²⁶ On Photios' description of Lucian's style see Zappala 1990, 25–26.

²⁷ Pignani (ed) 1969, 6.

²⁸ Marciniak 2019, 43–52

²⁹ He discusses, for instance, the name of the father of Herodotus (*Chil.* 1.22b.4), referring to *Dom* 20.6–7 (ἥδη ὁ κῆρυξ προσκάλει αὐτὸν Ἡρόδοτον Λύξου Ἀλικαρνασόθεν); history of Apelles being slandered (*Chil.* 197) taken from *Cal* 5.

³⁰ Lucian is absent from the discussion concerning dialogues but, interestingly, so is Plato. Gregory lists Plutarch and Basil the Great (*Commentary on Pseudo-Hermogenes' On the Method of Skilfulness* 7.2, p. 1347, ed. Walz).

³¹ Which is sharply contrasted with such an interest when it comes to other ancient writers.

³² Tzetzes, *Scholia ad exegesis in Iliadem* 61: "Επεὶ τινες Σύρον δοκοῦντες εἶναι τὸν ῥήτορα τοῦτον, εὐρίσκοντες δὲ ἐτέρφ' τοῦτου συγγράμματι Πατρεᾶ αὐτὸν ἐπιγράφοντα, δύο νομίζουσι τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ ἓνα τυγχάνειν Λουκιανόν, ὥρμησα τοῦτο τῇ παρουσίᾳ σαφηνίσαι γραφῇ. Σύροι μὲν γὰρ οἱ γονεῖς ἦσαν τοῦ ῥήτορος, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἀπόδουλοι, καθὼς ὁ αὐτὸς ῥήτωρ συγγέγραφε, περὶ Πάτρας δὲ ἐκ Συρίας ἐλθόντες κατῴκησαν." For the discussion on the identity of Lukios of Patras see Finkerpearl 2007, 263–276.

a lie (“τοῦτο γε μόνον οὐχὶ ψευδόμενος”, PG 133:1293).³³ Apparently, Prodrōmos saw this work as different from other fictitious Lucianic narratives, perhaps he even viewed it as Lucian’s own manifesto. It is little wonder that the Byzantine writer, who himself was slandered³⁴ and constantly faced competition from other teachers, interpreted this text in a personal way.³⁵ However, such theoretical and/or personal remarks are exceptions rather than the rule.

In the twelfth century, Lucian is imitated³⁶ but not commented upon. Never before, and rarely after in the Byzantine period,³⁷ were so many works penned which drew on the Lucianic corpus in vocabulary, style, ideas and content.³⁸ Despite this vogue for Lucian, there is not a single extant manuscript from this century that contains the rhetor’s works. This is curious because, as Wilson remarked, the twelfth century “was not an age of declining book production.”³⁹ However other ancient writers are also underrepresented⁴⁰; perhaps enough didactic manuscripts from previous centuries still circulated to meet the needs of students and teachers. The lack of contemporaneous manuscripts could also be incidental (although this is less probable that all such manuscripts perished). It may also suggest that heightened twelfth-century interest in ancient works was less about these texts themselves and more about what the literati could do with them in terms of creative recycling. Lucianic writings became, as Psellos suggested, a good model for light, entertaining discourse. Perhaps such discourse was in greater demand in the Komnenian period than in earlier eras.⁴¹

Lucianic *schede* of the twelfth-century

Recently *schede*, or didactic exercises, have attracted increased scholarly attention.⁴² Herbert Hunger’s preliminary definition, which describes them as school exercises appropriate for teaching children important lessons, such as grammar, is today too general.⁴³

³³ Cal 1: “Δεινὸν γε ἡ ἄγνοια καὶ πολλῶν κακῶν ἀνθρώποις αἰτία” (“a terrible thing is ignorance, which is the source of endless human calamities”).

³⁴ See Prodrōmos, *Carm. hist.* 49.

³⁵ A twelfth-century dialogue ascribed to Niketas Eugenianos, *Anacharsis or Ananias*, offers perhaps the most extensive description of Lucian’s style: “Who would furnish me with the Syrian’s tongue, honey-sweet, fond of jeering and more pleasant than honey from the Attic mountain Hymettus. This language, while refuting some Hellenic nonsense, poured down great sarcasm and showered like hail the storm of jokes. And through this language I would have put to writing neither myths nor nonsense but true stories”, see Christidis 1984, 752–756.

³⁶ Marciniak 2016, 217–219.

³⁷ *Mazaris’ Journey to Hades*, which draws on the idea of the Lucianic *katabaseis*, mentions *Lucius or the Ass* (39.14–15): “The younger Alousianos (straight from the house of Patrokles, who never washed), belongs to the inner circle, with Loukios “or the ass” (transl. in *Mazaris’ Journey to Hades* 1975, 39.14–15).

³⁸ Marciniak 2016, 217–2.

³⁹ Wilson 2007, 57.

⁴⁰ There are almost no extant manuscripts containing ancient plays dating to the twelfth century (e. g. with the exception of Plut. 31.10, which however is dated to the period after the Komnenian revival). I am indebted to Lorenzo Maria Ciolfi for bringing this phenomenon to my attention.

⁴¹ A revival of novels in the Komnenian period might be yet another proof of the interest in the entertaining discourse.

⁴² Hunger 1978, II 25; ODB III 1849 (“a system of educational exercises introduced probably ca. 1000”); Browning 1976, 21–34; Gallavotti 1983, 12–35; Vassis 1993–94, 1–19; Polemis 1995, 277–302; Polemis 1997, 252–263; Miller 2003, 9–20; Agapitos 2014, 1–22; Agapitos 2015, 11–24.

⁴³ Hunger 1978, II 25: “Seit der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit, und zwar seit dem frühen 11. Jh., verstand man unter σχῆδος im technischen Sinne offenbar ein umfangmässig begrenztes Lehrstück, das in Prosa oder

While *schede* were often based on the lexical puzzles ἀντίστοιχα (“sound correspondences”),⁴⁴ there exist texts which defy easy definitions. Schedography is in fact an open genre, which can be modified and adapted according to the needs of a given author. Lucianic *schede* are a case in point.

The twelfth century brings several Lucianic *schede*, four of them will be analysed here.⁴⁵ Three were handed down in Vat. Pal. gr. 92:⁴⁶

- 1) Michael Attikos’ paraphrase of Lucian’s *Cataplus* [f. 188r, l. 5] Τοῦ κυροῦ Μιχαήλ τοῦ Ἀττικοῦ βίβλος Λουκιανοῦ (A)
- 2) Anonymous: a paraphrase of a passage from Lucian (Ἀναβιοῦντες ἢ ἀλιεύς 6) [fols. 225v–226r] (S₁)
- 3) Anonymous: a paraphrase of a passage from Lucian (Ἀναβιοῦντες ἢ ἀλιεύς 4–5) [fol. 226r–v]. (S₂)

The fourth one, of which only fragments remain, was transmitted by Paris gr. 2556.⁴⁷

- 4) Anonymous: a paraphrase of Lucian’s *Dialogue of the Dead* 13 [fol. 79]. (S₃)

Only one *schedos* is attributable, and we know little about its author. He might have been the Attikos mentioned by Anna Komnene in a long passage on the art of schedography in the *Alexiad*.⁴⁸ This *schedos*, based on chapter 18 of the *Voyage to the Lower World*, is a short dialogue between Charon, Mikyllos and Klotho (none of the names is mentioned in the manuscript, which is common).⁴⁹ The text is changed both on the level of grammar and vocabulary,⁵⁰ e. g.:

A: οὐ γὰρ δίκαιόν ἐστι ἐλθεῖν

Cat 18: οὐ θέμις οὕτω σε διελθεῖν (the word θέμις from the original is replaced with a less sophisticated δίκαιον).

This is perhaps the most typical example of a *schedos*, as it contains examples of *antis-toicha* such as: πόσ’ ἄγη = πῶς ἄγη; εἴ ναῖ, πω = ἵνα εἴπω, which makes it more complicated than the other three. Similarly, *antistoicha* can be found in the text preserved in Paris gr. 2556, where they are easier to decipher (την ει = τινι). Again, the grammatical and lexical changes are substantial.⁵¹ However, since this *schedos* is preserved only fragmentarily, it is difficult to say anything decisive about its exact composition.

in Versen — in einer für kindliche Gemüter berechneten Methode verschiedenes Wissenwertes, vor allem aus der Grammatik, vermitteln sollte.”

⁴⁴ Agapitos 2014: 5: “The pupils had to decode such a puzzle and to rewrite it correctly. The puzzles were based on ἀντίστοιχα (“sound correspondences”); these could be similarly sounding verbal or nominal forms, or they could be wrongly written words or phrases.”

⁴⁵ There are two more Lucianic *schede* transmitted in the manuscript Marc. XI. 31: *DDeor* 3 (incipit: Οὐ φέρομεν τὸν πλείστων πλούτων ἀξιοῦντα) and *DDeor* 4 (incipit: Ὡ Κέρβερε, ἴθι μοι λέξον). Konstantinos Manafis has surmised that these *schede* were penned by Basil Padiadites, see Manafis 1976–1977, 311. See also Messis (forthcoming). Unfortunately, I was unable to consult this manuscript.

⁴⁶ Description of the codex in Stevenson 1895: 46. The origins of the manuscript are disputed but most likely it comes from Southern Italy Armesano 2008: 78. On the schedographic collection and its dating see Vassis 2002, 39.

⁴⁷ Polemis 1995, 277–302, esp. 279.

⁴⁸ Reinsch — Kambyllis (eds) 2001, 485, 15.7.9; Agapitos 2013, 94, no. 25.

⁴⁹ I have consulted the manuscript in situ.

⁵⁰ Cat 18: λελείψομαι = A: περιλελείψομαι.

⁵¹ L : Μὴ γελάσω οὖν, ὦ Ἀλέξανδρε, ὁρῶν καὶ ἐν ἄδου ἔτι σε μωραίνοντα = S3: 5 οὐ γελάσω οὖν ὦ Ἀλέξανδρε, ὁρῶν ὅτι καὶ ἐν Ἄδου ἔτι σοι μωρίαί εἰσίν.

In contrast, *schede* S₁ and S₂ are less complicated. *Antistoichic* elements are rare⁵² and sometimes introduced in a way that suggests the correct answer. For instance:

S₂: καὶ ὁ σιγῶν οὗτος καὶ ὡσεὶ ὅπῳ Πυθαγόρας
Pisc 4: καὶ ὁ σιωπῶν οὗτος Πυθαγόρας καὶ Διογένης

The verb σιωπῶν from the original is replaced by its synonym, σιγῶν. However, immediately following is the formulation ὡσεὶ ὅπῳ, which should be corrected to ὁ σιωπῶν.⁵³ In other words, the solution is suggested in the text itself. Some of the changes in S₁ and S₂ are minor and represent possible grammatical variations (S₂: σοὶ λόγους instead of σου λόγους) or clarify the meaning of a phrase (S₂: μᾶλλον δὲ φυλάττετε τὰ βάρη, the schedographer added τὰ βάρη). Yet some alterations are surprising, as they transform simple formulations into complex ones. For instance the simple Lucianic form ληρεῖς has been changed to λήρων ἔχη (S₂), while λαβῶν has been replaced with the more complicated παρεληφώς (S₁). At times a schedographer has added words, which possibly were meant to clarify the meaning of the text:

S₂: καὶ ὁ Πλάτων δ' ἐγὼ εἰσέτι
Pisc 4: καὶ ὁ Πλάτων ἐγὼ

The word εἰσέτι is additionally explained by the interlinear note as σὺν τούτοις (“with them”). This particular passage, where Platon enumerates various philosophers ridiculed by Lucian/Parrhesiades, is especially interesting because it demonstrates that a schedographer could alter his source text quite considerably.

S₃: Πυθαγόρας χήρῃ ἴσος μὴ φθεγγόμενος· καὶ Διογένης καὶ ἅπαντες ὁπόσους σκώπτειν (?), καὶ διαβάλλειν καὶ διασύρειν ἤθελες ἐν τοῖς λόγοις μιμούμενος.
Pisc 4: ὁ σιωπῶν οὗτος Πυθαγόρας Πυθαγόρας καὶ Διογένης καὶ ἅπαντες ὁπόσους διέσυρες ἐν τοῖς λόγοις.

The original phrase “καὶ ἅπαντες ὁπόσους διέσυρες ἐν τοῖς λόγοις” was replaced with a much more elaborated “καὶ ἅπαντες ὁπόσους σκώπτειν, καὶ διαβάλλειν καὶ διασύρειν ἤθελες ἐν τοῖς λόγοις μιμούμενος”. This change seems to be, however, more than a simple addition of the synonyms (σκώπτειν, διαβάλλειν). This passage reinforces the typical Byzantine image of Lucian as the author whose specialty was mockery. Moreover, the addition “ἐν τοῖς λόγοις μιμούμενος” (“imitating in the writings”) is a clear expansion of Lucian’s original thought as it suggests that Lucian not only mocked but also imitated the philosophical writings. This addition may be read as a clarification of the passage as students might not be acquainted with the entire dialogue in which Lucian/Parrhesiades is confronted with philosophers, who, having heard about the *Sale of Lives*, accuse him of hatred towards both them and philosophy.⁵⁴ Yet, it would be tempting to assume that the schedographer’s intention was also to teach about Lucian and his writings. It is not completely clear why certain passages were chosen as the schedographic exercises but perhaps

⁵² S₁: ἐφηλῶ = ἐφ’ ἥλων.

⁵³ The interlinear note, however, seems to refer to the word ὅπῳ as it adds the word τῶν φωνῶν.

⁵⁴ Interestingly enough, Lucian’s *Sale of Lives* was successfully imitated in the twelfth-century by Theodore Prodromos.

some were attractive didactically not only because of the grammar and vocabulary but also in terms of their content.

All *schede* are accompanied by interlinear notes, which generally define a word by providing a synonym, e. g. S₁: ἴσα explained by ἐπίσης; πεπονθῶς = παθῶν; S₃: ἀγάγη = φέρη. Sometimes, however, they offer an explanation meant to clarify the meaning of a phrase (e. g. S₁: εἰσέτι explained by καὶ σὺν τούτοις). Whether or not these notes and explanations come from a schedographer, from a later reader or from both is unclear; all cases are possible.

The four *schede* discussed here vary considerably. For example, A and S₃ are more difficult to read and understand and require an excellent grasp of the language. The differences in complexity may suggest that they were meant for students at various linguistic stages. In case of the more difficult *schede*, students were supposed to correct mistakes. The situation might be different with regard to less complex exercises. The *antistoicha* are simpler and less advanced students might have been required to explain changes made by a teacher at grammar and lexical levels (e. g. to parse the more complex words introduced by a teacher).

A sample of four pieces is too small to support a broad conclusion, which would require a thorough analysis of the entire schedographical corpus. However, unlike *schede* based on ancient novels,⁵⁵ these only teach grammar, vocabulary and, perhaps, ways to manipulate (that is to change) style. Whether this demonstrates that Lucian texts were primarily used as a form of prose composition manuals remains unclear (although this is a very tempting conclusion).

Conclusion

The *schede* analysed in this paper prove that Lucian had his place in the Byzantine educational system. And yet, perhaps the most intriguing aspect of teaching Lucian in the Middle Byzantine period is the marked contrast between his absence from rhetorical treatises and his popularity as a literary (or perhaps more precisely: stylistic) model. He suffered Aristophanes' fate in reverse. Aristophanes was, in the twelfth-century, commented upon by John Tzetzes; Gregory of Pardos, in *Commentary on Pseudo-Hermogenes' On the Method of Skilfulness*, uses examples from his plays to exemplify "comic style"; and Eustathios' commentaries contain numerous allusions to his plays. It is also telling that Prodromos, in the *Bion Praxis*, makes Aristophanes a model of offensive/satirical speaking.⁵⁶ Yet no single work exists (or has survived) modelled on Aristophanes' writings to the same extent as the Prodromic satires were modelled on Lucian's texts (even though there are texts, which draw on Aristophanic vocabulary and imagery). Perhaps this can be explained by the fact that Lucian's dialogues and orations were more easily imitated than Aristophanic plays for a society in which drama did not exist. Not to mention that they might have been also more useful. It is tempting to conclude that, because of his anti-Christian views, it was safer to use Lucian as a literary and language model than to analyse him and his writings in the same way as other pagan authors.⁵⁷ Such a hypothesis remains, however, difficult to prove.

⁵⁵ These *schede* have recently been analysed by Nilsson-Zagklas 2017, 1120–1148.

⁵⁶ Marciniak 2013, 219–239.

⁵⁷ It is noteworthy that one of the very few attempts at a more thorough analysis of the rhetor's works was Alexios Makrembolites' fourteenth-century allegorical interpretation of Lucian's *Lucius or the Ass*, which sought to establish this text's hidden Christian dimension, see Roilos 2005, 136.

Diplomatic transcriptions from: **Pal. gr. 92**. In the apparatus, except for the additions and corrections, the possible solutions for the antistoichic riddles were offered. The first version of the transcription was prepared by Lorenzo Maria Ciolfi.⁵⁸

Michael Attikos' paraphrase of Lucian's *Cataplus* 18

[f. 188r, l. 5] Τοῦ κυροῦ Μιχαήλ τοῦ Ἀττικοῦ βίβλος Λουκιανοῦ +

[1] [l. 6] (Χάρων).⁵⁹ Σὺ⁶⁰ μὲν ὁ τὴν πῆραν τῶν ὥμων οὗτος⁶¹ φέρων ἐξηρτημένην πόσ' ἄγη⁶² στήθ' ἄρ' ὡς λίαν μωρός μοι δοκεῖς· τὸ πορθμεῖον ὅλον νενεκρωμένων⁶³ ὡς καὶ σοὶ δῆλον καὶ πᾶσι γ' ἔρε⁶⁴ τῷ καθορᾶν· περιμένειν αὐτοῦ μικρὸν τι ἀκαίρῳ σπουδῇ ἀποταξάμενος· εἴτ' ἐς' ἔω δὴ διαπορθμεύσομαι προσηκόντως ἡμεῖς⁶⁵ καταλαβόντες⁶⁶ τὴν αὐρίον.

[5] (Μίκυλλος).⁶⁷ Ἀδικεῖς μ' ἐώλων νεκρῶν ὑπηργμένον ὦ Χάρων εἰ ναῆ, πω⁶⁸, δῆλον καὶ τοῦτο τῷ πλήθει τῶν ἐνταυθοῖ παροντῶν⁶⁹ νεκῶν· ἀμέλει ἀνφαίρων⁷⁰ ἐπὶ τοῦ Ῥαδαμάνθυος καὶ τιθεῖς ἐπὶ μέσον τὸ παρὸν ἔγκλημα πλεῖστ' ἄσαιμι⁷¹ διαβαλὼν εὐλόγως· σ' ⁷² ὀρμηθεῖς⁷³ κατὰ σοῦ· τουδί μου ἐν μέρει ἀκρωμένου καὶ σοῦ· ἀλλ' οἴμοι τῶν κακῶν⁷⁴ πλέουσιν οἱ δι⁷⁵ μὴ ὑποθήσαντες⁷⁶ ὡς ἔοικεν ἐπὶ λογισμῶν τὴν ἡμετέραν παράκλησιν· καὶ διὰ τοῦτ' ὥδι μόνος [10] αὐτὸς λελείψομαι ὅτου δ' ἐνοῦν [?], νέκυσ ὦν δῆτ' εἰς τὸ ἐπὶ νήχεσθαι⁷⁷ κατ' αὐτοὺς οὐχ' αἰρήσομαι χάριν αὐτόν⁷⁸· οὐ γὰρ δεῖ μ' ἐνι [?] μοι τί ἐπισχετικὸν τοῦ τοιοῦτου τολμήματος, μή πως τὸ πλεῖν ἀπειπῶν τε γενήσομαι τεθνεώς καὶ ἀποπνιγῆσομαι θυμὸν τὸν οἰκεῖον ἐκπεπνευκῶς πρὸ τῆς σήμερον· ἄλλως τε, οὐδὲ τῷ ὅλῳ, ἔχων⁷⁹ ὡς ἄπορος ὦν τίς συλλογῇ⁸⁰ καταβαλεῖν, τὰ πορθμεῖα τὸν ὀβολόν·

[15] (Κλωθώ).⁸¹ Μίκυλλε ⁸²μείνον μηδαμῶς τοῦτο δράσης· οὐ γὰρ δίκαιόν ἐστι ἐλθεῖν [f. 188v] ἐνθάδε οὕτω σε λυτρώς τὸν πλόον τεθεικότα +

Suprascripts: 5 ἐώλων] χθεσινῶν 6 ἀνφαίρων] καὶ ἐπαίρων

⁵⁸ I am very grateful for Mr. Ciolfi's kind help and effort. All subsequent alterations are my own as well as all mistakes, which might have resulted from such changes. The following diplomatic transcription is provided in order to give the reader a better understanding of the material discussed in the paper.

⁵⁹ — *scripsi*.

⁶⁰ “Σ” placed in *ekthesis*, executed and decorated in blue ink.

⁶¹ οὕτως.

⁶² πῶς ἄγη;

⁶³ Νενεκρωμένον.

⁶⁴ γέρε (as parenthetical element).

⁶⁵ ἡμᾶς *fortasse*.

⁶⁶ καταλαβόντας *fortasse*.

⁶⁷ — *scripsi*.

⁶⁸ ἵνα εἴπω.

⁶⁹ Παρόντων.

⁷⁰ ἀνφέρων *ante corr.* : ἀναφέρων.

⁷¹ ἄσαιμη *ante corr.*

⁷² εὐλόγως σέ.

⁷³ εὐλόγως· ὅς *ante corr.*

⁷⁴ τῶν κακῶν!

⁷⁵ οἰδί.

⁷⁶ ὑποθήσαντες.

⁷⁷ ἐπινήχεσθαι.

⁷⁸ αὐτῶν.

⁷⁹ τε οὐδὲ τὸ ὅλον ἔχων.

⁸⁰ συλλογῇ.

⁸¹ *scripsi*.

⁸² cod. Μήκυλλε

(S₁)

ANONYMOUS, *Paraphrase from Lucian's Ἀναβιοῦντες ἡ ἁλιεύς* (§ 6)

[f. 225v, l. 19]

[1] [Π]οσ' ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς ἢ πότε ὕβρικα· ὃς φιλοσοφίαν θαυμάζων διατετέλεκ' αἰεὶ καὶ ὑμᾶς αὐτοὺς ὑπερεπαινῶν καὶ αὐτὸν εἶδει τῶν λόγων ὧν καταλελοίπατ' ἐφηλῶν⁸³ αὐτὰ γοῦν οὐ φημι ταῦτα; πόθεν ἄλλοθεν ἢ παρ' ὑμῶν παρειληφώς καὶ ἀπανθισάμενος οὐ μετὰ νωθρείας ἴσα μελίση ὡς σοφῶς [f. 226r]

ἐπιδείκνυμαι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις· οἱ δὲ, ἐπαινοῦσι καὶ γνωρίζουσιν ἐκάστου

[5] τὸ ἄνθος ὅθεν ἀναλεξάμενος καὶ παρὰ τοῦ τῷ Δι⁸⁴ ἐνωραίζομαι· καὶ ἀναλεξάμενον μὲν ζηλοῦσιν ἐμὲ τῷ τοιούτῳ λόγῳ· τὸ δ' ἀληθὲς ὑμᾶς· καὶ τὸν λειμῶνα τὸν ὑμετέρων οἱ τοιαῦτα ἐξηγθίκα⁸⁵ τ' αἶολα καὶ τὰς βαφὰς πολυειδῆ σφόδρα· ἔστιν οὖν ὁ ταῦτα πεπονθὼς παρ' ὑμῶν κακῶς ἂν ἐπιχειρήσῃ ἐνιπὴν· καὶ λοιδορίαν προσενεγκεῖν εὐεγέταις ἀνδράσιν· ἀνθ' ὧν δόξαν ἔδωκεν εἶναι τις στίφει ἀνθρώπων· ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ κατὰ Θάμυριν εἴῃ ἢ Εὐρυτον μορὸν⁸⁶ βροτὸν [10] τὴν φύσιν· ὡς ταῖς Μούσαις ἀντάδειν παρ' ὧν εἰλήφει τὴν ὠδὴν· ἢ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι ἐριδαίνειν ἐναντία βάλλων τῇ τόξῳ, καὶ ταῦτα δοτῆρ' ὄντι· τάσει τῆς τοξικῆς· +

SUPRASCRIPTS: 1 [Π]οσ' καὶ ποῦ ὕβρικα] καὶ ὕβρισα 2 εἶδει] τῇ θεωρίᾳ ἐφηλῶν] καὶ πρὸ καρφῶν⁸⁷ 3 ἴσα] ἐπίσης 5 παρὰ] τίνος τῷ] καὶ ἐν τούτῳ 6 ὑμᾶς] ζηλοῦσιν 7 οἱ] οὔτινες αἶολα] καὶ ποικίλα πεπονθὼς] καὶ παθὼν 8 ἐνιπὴν] καὶ [ἐκπληξιν 9 δόξαν] καὶ νόησιν στίφει] καὶ τῷ πλήθει 11 ἐριδαίνειν] καὶ φιλονεικεῖν

(S₂)

ANONYMOUS, *Paraphrase from Lucian's Ἀναβιοῦντες ἡ ἁλιεύς* (§ 4–5)

[f. 226r, l. 13]

[1] [Α]τινα μὲν ἡμᾶς εἴργασαι δεῖνὰ σεαυτὸν ἐρώτα ὦ κάκιστε· καὶ τοὺς καλοὺς ἐκείνους σοι λόγους ἐν οἷς αἱ καὶ ἐς φιλοσοφίαν τὲ αὐτὴν ἡμᾶς ὕβριζες· ἐφ' οἷς ἀγανακτήσαντες σὺν δρόμῳ, πρὸς σὲ ἀνελθούμεν, συγχωρηθέντες πρὸς ὀλίγον τι ὀξεῖ, Αἰδωνεῖ· Χρῦσιππος οὐτοσί καὶ Ἐπίκουρος· καὶ ὁ Πλάτων δ' ἐγὼ εἰσέτι καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐκεῖνος· καὶ ὁ σιγῶν οὗτος καὶ ὡσεὶ ὁπῶν Πυθαγόρας χήρῳ ἴσος μὴ φθειγόμενος· καὶ Διογένης καὶ ἅπαντες ὁπόσους σκώπτῃν⁸⁸, καὶ διαβάλλειν καὶ διασύρειν ἠθέλες ἐν τοῖς λόγοις μιμούμενος.

—⁸⁹ Ἀνέπνευσ· οὐ γὰρ με εἰ γνώῃ ὁ ἡμετέρος σύλλογος ὁποῖος περὶ ὑμᾶς ἐγενόμην κανεῖ ἰταμῶς· ὥστε ἀπορρίψατε τῶν λίθων [f. 226v] μάλλον δὲ φυλάττετε τὰ βάρη· χρήσασθε γὰρ αὐτοῖς κατὰ τῶν ἀξίων.

[10] —⁹⁰ Λήρων ἔχη σε δὲ χρὴ σήμερον ἀπολωλέναι· καὶ ἤδη γε λαΐνον ἔσσο χιτῶνα κακῶν ἔνεχ' ὅσα ἔοργας.

—⁹¹ Καὶ μὴν ὦ ἄριστοι ὃν ἐχρήν ἐξ ἀπάντων αἰῶν ἡγεῖσθαι ἄξιον οἰκεῖον τε ὑμῖν ὄντα καὶ εὖνφ εἶναι θέλοντα καὶ εὐγνωμονοῦντα, ἴσον; εὖ ἴστε ἀποκτενοῦντες ἢν ἐμὲ ἀποκτείνῃτε τοσαῦτα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἰδικοτά, ὁρᾶτε γοῦν μὴ ἀχάριστοι φαινόμενοι κατὰ τοὺς νῦν φιλοσόφους αὐτὸ

[15] ποιῆτε καὶ ἀγνώμονες, μῆνι, τε φίλοι πρὸς ἄνδρα εὐεργέτην +

⁸³ ἐφ' ἧλων.

⁸⁴ Δι.

⁸⁵ ἐξηγθίκα.

⁸⁶ μωρόν.

⁸⁷ Ὁ προσκαρφῶν?

⁸⁸ Σκώπτειν. Yet, according to the interlinear note, the anonymous reader/author seemed not to understand the word as the infinitive form of the verb. Both words sound the same, however, only the infinitive is grammatically correct. The interlinear explanation might suggest that whoever added it, did not pay much attention to the entire text but rather was preoccupied with explaining particular words and phrases.

⁸⁹ — scripsi.

⁹⁰ — scripsi.

⁹¹ — scripsi.

Suprascripts: 1 εἶργασαι] εἰργάσω 2 αἶ] φεῦ 3 ὀξεῖ] καὶ ταχεῖ Αἰδωνεῖ] καὶ Ἄδη
 Χρύσιππος] ὑπαρχὸν οὐτοσί] καὶ οὗτος εἰσέτι] καὶ σὺν τούτοις καὶ] καθ' 4 ὁπῶν] καὶ τῶν φωνῶν
 χήρῳ] καὶ ἐστερημένῳ 5 ἴσος] ὁμοῖος 5 σκώπτῃν] καὶ λοῖδορον εἰ] ἐὰν γνώῃ] νοήσῃ κανεῖ] καὶ κόψει
 7 ἱταμῶς] πῶς 10 Λήρων] καὶ φλυαριῶν σε] καὶ ἄπτη (?) λάϊνον] καὶ λίθινον ἔσσο] καὶ ἐνδέθυσσο
 ἔνεχ'] καὶ χάριν ὄσα] καὶ ὁπόσα 11 ἔοργας] καὶ ἔπραξας 12 ὄν] καὶ ὄντινα ἐχρήν] καὶ ἔπρεπεν εὖνῳ]
 καὶ φρονίμῳ 13 ἴσον] καὶ ὁμοῖον ἴστε] καὶ γινώσκετε ἦν] καὶ ἐὰν 14 ἰδικότα] κεκοπιακότα (?) 15 μῆνι]
 καὶ τῇ ὀργῇ]

Bibliography

- Agapitos P. Anna Komnene and the Politics of Schedographic Training and Colloquial Discourse. *Néa Pómy. Rivista di ricerche bizantinistiche* 2013, 10, 89–107.
- Agapitos P. Grammar, Genre and Politics in Komnenian Constantinople: Redefining a Scientific Paradigm in the History of Byzantine Literature. *JÖB* 2014, 64, 1–22.
- Agapitos P. Learning to Read and Write a Schedos: The Verse Dictionary of Par. gr. 400, in: E. Efthymiadis, (eds) *Pour une poétique de Byzance. Hommage à Vassilis Katsaros*. Paris, De Boccard, 2015, 11–24.
- Angelidi C. The Dreams of a Woman: An Episode from the Life of Andrew the Fool, in: T. Antonopoulou, S. Kotzabassi, and M. Loukaki (eds) *Myriobiblos: Essays on Byzantine Literature and Culture*. Berlin–Boston, De Gruyter, 2015, 33–34.
- Arnesano D. *La minuscola “barocca”: Scritture e libri in Terra d’Otranto nei secoli XIII e XIV* (Fonti medievali e moderne 12). Galatina, Congedo Editore, 2008.
- Bachmann A. *Anecdota Graeca*, vol. 2. Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs, 1828, 319–48.
- Barber C., Papaioannou S. *Michael Psellos on literature and art. A Byzantine perspective on aesthetics*. Notre Dame, IN, University of ND Press, 2017.
- Boudreaux P. Le lexique de Lucien. *Revue de philologie* 1906, n.s. 30, 51–53.
- Browning R. Il codice Marciano gr. XI. 31 e la schedografia bizantina in: R. Avesani *Miscellanea Marciana di Studi Bessarionei*, Padua 1976, 21–34.
- Christidis D. A. Theodore Phialites and Michael Gabras: A Supporter and an Opponent of Lucian in the 14th Century, in: M. Tziatzi et al. (eds) *Lemmata: Beiträge zum Gedenken an Christos Theodoridis*. Berlin, De Gruyter, 2015, 542–549.
- Christidis D. A. *Markiana anekdota: Anacharsis ē Ananias; Epistoles, Sigillio*. Thessalonike, Philosophike Schole tu Aristoteleiu Panepistemiou, 1984.
- Constantinides C. N. *Higher education in Byzantium in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries (1204–ca. 1310)*, Nicosia, Zavallis Press, 1982.
- Dickey E. *Ancient Greek Scholarship. A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises, from Their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Efthymiadis S. L’enseignement secondaire à Constantinople pendant les XI e et XII e siècles: Modèle éducatif pour la Terre d’Otrante au XIII e siècle, *Néa Pómy. Rivista di ricerche bizantinistiche*, 2005, 2, 259–275.
- Finkerpearl E. Apuleius, the Onos and Rome, in: M. Paschalis, S. Frangoulidis et al. (eds.) *The Greek and the Roman Novel. Parallel Readings*. Groningen, Barkhuis, 2007, 263–276.
- Gallavotti C. Nota sulla schedografia di Moscopulo e suoi precedenti fino a Teodoro Prodromo. *BollClass SER. III* 1983, 4, 3–35.
- Hult K. (ed. and transl.) *Theodore Metochites on Ancient Authors and Philosophy: Semeioseis gnomikai 1–26 & 71; A Critical Edition with Introduction, Translation, Notes and Indexes*. Goteborg, Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, 2002.
- Hörandner W. Pseudo-Gregorios Korinthios Über die vier Teile der perfekten Rede. *Medioevo Greco* 2012, 12, 87–131.
- Hunger H. *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, 2 vols., Munich, C. H. Beck, 1978.
- Kaster R. A. *Guardian of Language: the Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley–Los Angeles–London, University of California Press 1988, 394–396.
- Leeuw M. de. Der Coislinianus 345 im Kloster Megisti Lavra (Athos). *ZPE*, 2000, 131, 58–64.

- Lemerle P. *Le premier humanisme byzantin. Notes et remarques sur enseignement et culture à Byzance des origines au Xe siècle*, Paris, PUF, 1971.
- Manafis K. Ανέκδοτος νεκρικός διάλογος υπαινισσόμενος πρόσωπα και γεγονότα της βασιλείας Ανδρονίκου Α' του Κομνηνού. *Ἀθηνᾶ* 1976–1977, 77, 308–32.
- Marciniak P. *Reinventing Lucian in Byzantium*. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 2016, 70, 209–224.
- Marciniak P. *The paradoxical enkōmion and the Byzantine reception of Lucian's Praise of the Fly*. *Medioevo Greco* 2019, 19, 141–150.
- Marciniak P. *Theodore Prodromos' Bion Prasis — a Reappraisal*. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 2013 Vol 53 (1), 219–239.
- Markopoulos A. *De la structure de l'école byzantine: Le maître, les livres et le processus éducatif*, in B. Mondrain (ed.) *Lire et écrire à Byzance*. Paris, Peeters Publishers, 2006.
- Mazaris' *Journey to Hades or Interviews with Dead Men about Certain Officials of the Imperial Court*. *Greek text with translation, notes, introduction and index by Seminar Classics 609*. Buffalo, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1975.
- Messis C. *On Fortune of Lucian in Byzantium*, in P. Marciniak, I. Nilsson (eds) *A Golden Age of Laughter? Satire and parody in the Middle Byzantine Period* (forthcoming).
- Miller T.S. Two Teaching Texts from the Twelfth-Century Orphanotropheion, in: J.W. Nesbitt (ed.) *Byzantine Authors: Literary Activities and Preoccupations. Texts and Translations dedicated to the Memory of Nicolas Oikonomides*. Leiden–Boston, Brill, 2003, 9–20.
- Newlin C. Lucian and Liutprand. *Speculum* 1927, 2, 447–48.
- Nilsson I., Zagklas N. “Hurry up, Reap Every Flower of the logoi!” The Use of Greek Novels in Byzantium. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 2017, 57, 1120–1148.
- Pignani A. Un opuscolo già male attribuito: L'encomio del cane di Niceforo Basilace. *Le Parole e le idee* 1969, 41–42, 59–68.
- Polemis D. Προβλήματα της βυζαντινής σχεδογραφίας. *Hellenika* 1995, 45, 277–302.
- Polemis, D. Philologische und historische Probleme in der schedographischen Sammlung des Codex Marcianus Gr. XI, 31. *Byzantion* 1997, 67, 252–263.
- Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit*, ed. E. Trapp et al, Wien: ÖAW, 2001.
- Rabe H. (ed.) *Scholia in Lucianum*. Leipzig, Teubner, 1906.
- Reinsch D. R., Kambylis A. (eds) *Annae Comnenae Alexias*, Berlin–New York, De Gruyter, 2001.
- Roilos P. *Amphoteroglossia: A Poetics of the Twelfth Century Medieval Novel*. Washington DC, Center for Hellenic Studies, 2005.
- Russo G. *Contestazione e conservazione: Luciano nell'esegesi di Areta*, Boston–Berlin, De Gruyter, 2011.
- Stevenson H. (recensuit et digessit). *Codices manuscripti Palatini Graeci Bibliothecae Vaticani descripti preside I. B. Cardinali Pitra*, Roma, Ex Typographeo Vaticano, 1895.
- Treadgold W. J. W. *The Nature of the Bibliotheca of Photius*. Washington, DC, *Dumbarton Oaks*, 1980.
- Vassis I. Των νέων Φιλολόγων Παλαιίσματα. Η συλλογή σχεδών του κώδικα Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 92. *Hellenika* 2002, 52, 37–68.
- Vassis I. Graeca sunt, non leguntur: Zu den schedographischen Spielereien des Theodoros Prodromos. *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 1993–1994, 86–87, 1–19.
- Wilson N. *Some Observations on the Fortunes of Lucian*, in: *Filologia, Papirologia, Storia dei Testi: Giornate di studio in onore di Antonio Carlini*. Pisa, Fabrizio Serra Editore, 2007, 53–61.
- Wilson N. *Scholars of Byzantium*, London, Duckworth, 1996.
- Zappala M. O. *Lucian of Samosata in the Two Hesperias: An Essay in Literary and Cultural Translation*. Potomac, Scripta Humanistica, 1990.

Received: June 19, 2019

Accepted: September 2, 2019